

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application and Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25 and 26 are amended. Support for amendments to Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25 and 26 can be found, for example, in the specification at page 21, lines 19 to page 23, line 13. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Izumi (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0132584).

Before turning to the outstanding prior art rejections, it is believed that a brief review of the present invention would be helpful.

In this regard, the present invention describes a wireless communication system which includes a plurality of terminals. In a non-limiting example, shown in Figure 10, the system comprises an ad-hoc network including Terminal A and Terminal B. Terminal A, using the ad-hoc network, sends a beacon signal to Terminal B that includes an identifier, used to identify the type of certificate of privilege, and an operation mode indicator, used to indicate the operation mode of the terminal. Terminal B then responds by requesting authentication using the type of certificate of privilege which matches the identifier and indicates a right concerning the operation mode.

Turning now to the §102(b) rejection in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) rejection based on Izumi for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

an ad-hoc network;  
a first terminal configured to send, using the ad-hoc network, a signal that includes beacon information having an identifier that identifies a type of certificate of privilege; and  
a second terminal configured to send, using the ad-hoc network, an authentication request to the first terminal in

response to the signal sent from the first terminal by providing the type of certificate of privilege which matches the identifier, wherein the certificate of privilege includes encrypted data for certifying the second terminal.

Claim 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 21, 23, 25 and 26 recite similar features.

Izumi describes a method of Bluetooth registration in which several apparatuses are registered with one another. Specifically, Izumi describes that a device A is registered with a device B followed by the device A registering with a device C. However, when device A registers with device C, device A also sends information to device C informing device C of the existence of device B.

However, Izumi does not describe or suggest a signal that includes beacon information having an identifier that identifies a type of certificate of privilege. Further, Izumi does not describe or suggest an authentication request to the first terminal in response to the signal sent from the first terminal by providing the type of certificate of privilege which matches the identifier.

In other words, Izumi describes that several terminals send messages to one another identifying themselves by providing Bluetooth ID numbers.<sup>1</sup> However, nowhere does Izumi describe beacon information that has an identifier identifying the type of certificate of privilege which is used by a first terminal. Further the Bluetooth ID number of Izumi is not equivalent to a certificate of privilege which includes encrypted data for certifying a second terminal.

Additionally, Izumi does not describe that a second terminal sends an authentication request to the first terminal in response to the signal sent from the first terminal by providing the type of certificate of privilege which matches the identifier.

Accordingly, as Izumi does not describe all of the features of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Izumi does not anticipate the claimed invention.

---

<sup>1</sup> Izumi, [0064], [0065].

Application No. 10/784,271  
Reply to Office Action of

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 and similarly independent Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 21, 23, 25 and 26 patentably distinguish over Izumi.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JL\249225US\249225US\_AM(8.21.2006).DOC